

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION THREE

In re K.K., a Person Coming Under the Juvenile Court Law.	B302879
THE PEOPLE, Plaintiff and Respondent, v. K.K., Defendant and Appellant.	(Los Angeles County Super. Ct. No. VJ46584)

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Kevin L. Brown, Judge. Affirmed.

Esther R. Sorkin, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

The minor K.K. appeals from an order sustaining a petition filed under Welfare and Institutions Code section 602. His appellate counsel filed a brief under *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.

The petition, filed in January 2019, alleged that K.K. committed misdemeanor shoplifting (Pen. Code, § 459.5; count 1) and misdemeanor petty theft (*id.*, §§ 484, subd. (a), 490.2; count 2). At the November 26, 2019 adjudication hearing, a loss protection detective testified that on October 17, 2018 he was working at a department store. K.K. caught his attention because K.K. had three bags (a large reusable one and two backpacks) and kept looking around him. K.K. quickly put a perfume set into a bag and left the store without paying for it. A store employee detained K.K., who had the perfume set and a mini instant camera, both from the store, in his bag. The perfume set cost \$93 and the camera cost \$69.95.

Based on this evidence, the trial court sustained the petition as to count 2 for misdemeanor petty theft but found count 1 for shoplifting not true and dismissed that count. The trial court transferred the matter to Orange County for disposition, because K.K. was on probation on a matter pending in that county.

K.K. appealed. After review of the record, K.K.'s court-appointed counsel filed an opening brief which raised no issues, asking this court to conduct an independent review of the record, under *People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d at page 441. By letter dated March 4, 2020, we advised that he had 30 days to submit by brief or letter any contentions or argument he wished this court to consider. He did not submit a brief.

We have reviewed the record and are satisfied that K.K.'s attorney has fully complied with the responsibilities of counsel and no arguable issue exists. (*People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 126; *People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d at p. 441.)

DISPOSITION

The order is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

DHANIDINA, J.

We concur:

EDMON, P. J.

EGERTON, J.